U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service

CMP-SPRCM-76-38

SELECTIONS FROM PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA MAGAZINES

U.S

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL
HONG KONG, B.C.C.

DECEMBER 1976

U.I.C.C.
JAN 27 1977
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023

https://archive.org/details/selections-from-prc-magazines_1976-12_38

CMP-SPRCM-76-38

中华人民共和国杂志选译

Selections from People's Republic of China Magazines

American Consulate General
Hong Kong

No. 901
December 6, 1976

This edition is printed in the United States of America for dissemination in the Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Mediterranean, and the west coast of Africa from material produced by the American Consulate General, Hong Kong. All queries concerning this edition should be sent to:

National Technical Information
Service (152.12)
U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield, Virginia 22151

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Historical Research)

Page

Lu Hsün's Struggle on the Cultural Front During the Second Revolutionary Civil War Period 1

Lu Hsün on "Nameless Ones" - by Hsü Huai-chung, Sun T'eng-fang and Liu Tsai-fu 25

TABLE OF CONTENTS: Historical Research
No. 3, June 20, 1976 36

* * *

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Lu Hsün's Struggle on the Cultural Front During the Second Revolutionary Civil War Period*

by

the Modern Literature Group of the Institute of Literature

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 4, August 20, 1976)

On April 12, 1927, Chiang Kai-shek started a counter-revolutionary coup with imperialist support, carrying out a bloody massacre of Communists and the revolutionary people and burying the spirited great revolution in China. "Thereupon unity was replaced by civil war, democracy by dictatorship, and a China full of brightness by a China covered in darkness. But the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people were neither cowed nor conquered nor exterminated. They picked themselves up, wiped off the blood, buried their fallen comrades and went into battle again." ("On Coalition Government")

It was at this time that Lu Hsün earnestly studied Marxism-Leninism, summed up his fighting experience, and "remedied" his "deviation of believing only in evolutionism." ("Three Leisures: Foreword") With a fearless, thoroughly revolutionary spirit and contempt for the White Terror of the Kuomintang reactionaries, he completely espoused the revolutionary truth of Marxism-Leninism, changing from a radical revolutionary democrat into a communist, and began a new fight. Since then, Lu Hsün waged a courageous, unyielding struggle against the counter-revolutionary cultural "encirclement and suppression" campaign of the Kuomintang. He resolutely exposed and denounced the savageous and atrocious acts of the Kuomintang reactionaries in persecuting and murdering the revolutionary people and revolutionary cultural workers, profoundly criticized all kinds of reactionary thought of the landlord-bourgeois classes and the erroneous lines pursued by the opportunists in the / Communist / Party, and defended the truth of Marxism-Leninism and Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. As Chairman Mao pointed out, "Communist Lu Hsün became a great man of China's cultural revolution in the midst of this 'encirclement and suppression' campaign."

Struggle Against the "New Moon Faction"

Lu Hsün's struggle against the "New Moon faction" was the first splendid battle he fought against the Kuomintang reactionary cultural "encirclement and suppression."

---

* This article is taken from the authors' "Lu Hsün Handbook: Brief History of a Life of Struggle." This part is divided into 22 sections, of which the present article is the seventh.

The New Moon Society was formed in Peking as early as 1923, its principal members being Hu Shih, Liang Shih-ch'iu, Hsü Chih-mo and Ch'en Hsi-ying, among others. It was the same black store as "Modern Review" society, though under a different signboard. In 1927, when the government of the Northern warlords was already falling apart, these men, realizing that their old masters were nearing their end, changed their color overnight and went en masse to Shanghai. From being accessories to the Northern warlords they became running dogs of the Chiang family dynasty.

In 1928, in the wake of a general debate on "revolutionary literature," there were even more widespread translations of and introductions to Marxist-Leninist theoretical works. This caused great alarm among the New Mooners. In March the same year, when the New Moon monthly made its debut, they began their attack on revolutionary literature.

In the inaugural issue of New Moon, Hsü Chih-mo wrote a message entitled "The Attitude of 'New Moon'," in which he claimed that "New Moon" was "independent," extolled its so-called "healthy outlook" and "dignity" and stressed its so-called "discipline" and "model character." While the Kuomintang reactionaries were wantonly slaughtering the communists and the revolutionary people and intensifying their fascist rule, such clamors of the New Mooners had only one object, which was consolidation of the KMT reactionary rule. The message also vigorously assailed the so-called "attackers," "radicals," "fanatics," "petty peddlers," "sloganists," and "doctrinaries," and launched a most vicious offensive against the emerging Left-wing literary and art movement. Hitting the nail on the head, Lu Hsün pointed out that such reactionary actions of the "New Mooners" were taken merely for the purpose of "maintaining the law and order" for the KMT and fulfilling the "task" of "executioners and bailiffs." ("Three Leisures: The Tasks of Critics of the New Moon Society")

In order to whitewash the brutal rule of the KMT reactionaries and rally around himself more flunkeys, Chiang Kai-shek made a personal appeal in a telegram to all newspapers in the country on December 27, 1929, in which he hypocritically invited "unreserved criticism" for the sake of "benefiting by mutual discussion," saying that "all wise words will be accepted with gratitude." Having received this imperial decree from their master, the "New Mooners" responded immediately by publishing Lo Lung-chi's "My 'Unreserved Criticism' of Party Affairs" in New Moon, Vol. 2, No. 8. With tongue in cheek, the article lauded Chiang Kai-shek in these words: "Reading this telegram, we little people who long for freedom of thought and speech are naturally overjoyed and inspired." They declared their loyalty to the Chiang imperial court and their willingness to erect a facade of so-called "freedom of thought and speech" for the KMT reactionaries in the hope of climbing to higher positions. So, their "unreserved criticism," as Lu Hsün pointed out, was nothing more than "warnings for the good of the other party." ("Two Hearts: 'Literal Translation' and 'Class Character of Literature'") Later, Hu Shih wrote to Ch'en Pu-lei, Chiang Kai-shek's trusted henchman, asking him to present a copy of New Moon to Chiang as a means of declaring his (Hu Shih's) stand against Marxism-Leninism and

proletarian revolution. In October 1931, Chiang Kai-shek indeed summoned Hu Shih to his presence and "consulted him about important matters of the state." With the slave offering his services and the master appreciating them, the two played a fascinating duet.

It was not accidental that the "New Mooners" were looked upon with favor by Chiang Kai-shek. They always called themselves an "independent" literary branch and always bore an evil, anti-communist, anti-people character. Their counter-revolutionary acts completely conformed to the KMT needs of "exterminating the communists." The bourgeois theory of human nature which their so-called literary critic Liang Shih-ch'iu advocated was a heart-digging tactic aimed at basically negating Marxism-Leninism. Ferociously launching an attack on the Left-wing literary and art movement represented by Lu Hsün, he produced at a stretch in the combined 6th-7th issue of New Moon such articles as "Does Literature Have a Class Character?" and "On Mr. Lu Hsün's 'Literal Translation'," viciously castigating Lu Hsün for translating Marxist literary and art theory and introducing it to China, saying disparagingly that it was "mechanical translation" which was "more difficult to understand than the mystic book of Heaven." Waving the threadbare banner of human nature, he said preposterously that there was no difference between capitalists and laborers where human nature was concerned, that both had the same emotions of "pleasure, anger, sadness and joy," that "literature is an art of expressing the most basic human nature," and that proletarian revolutionary literature "errs by imposing class restrictions on literature."

In March 1930, Lu Hsün published his famous long essay, "'Literal Translation' and 'Class Character of Literature'," declaring his strong determination to study and grasp Marxist-Leninist theory and stating that his translations and work of introduction in this regard were intended to make the mass of readers see the "fire and light" of Marxism-Leninism. On the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and objective facts of class struggle, Lu Hsün systematically refuted Liang Shih-ch'iu's fallacies both politically and ideologically. He pointed out sternly: Literature "in a class society cannot be deprived of its class character nor need be 'restricted.' Naturally, 'pleasure, anger, sadness and joy are human emotions.' But poor people will never experience the frustration of losing money in the stock exchange; the oil king can never know the miseries of the old women picking cinder in Peking; starving people in famine-stricken areas will probably not grow orchids like the old fathers of rich men do; and Chiao Ta of the House of Chia would not fall in love with the young ugly Miss Lin." These sharp contrasts reveal ruthless class antagonisms, and iron-clad facts show that the exploiters and the exploited do not share a common human nature. The erroneous views of Liang Shih-ch'iu's "are meant to negate the class character of literature and promote truth, but since they regard property as the progenitor of civilization and poor men as useless dross, a single glance will show that they are a weapon of struggle wielded by men of property." With strict logic, Lu Hsün dealt at length with the historical mission and future of development of proletarian revolutionary literature, pointing out profoundly: "The literature of proletarians is a wing of struggle by means of which they with their own strength are to

liberate their own class and all other classes, and it must have the overall position, not just a corner." ("Two Hearts: 'Literal Translation' and 'Class Character of Literature'")

Toward the end of 1930, Chiang Kai-shek began his first counter-revolutionary military "encirclement and suppression" campaign against the central Red base areas. Under Chairman Mao's wise leadership, the struggle against the military "encirclement and suppression" campaign won one great victory after another to the consternation of the reactionaries. In 1931 Lo Lung-chi, acting on behalf of the "New Mooners," openly suggested to the KMT reactionaries that military "encirclement and suppression" should be supplemented by ideological "encirclement and suppression" in order to eradicate communist ideology. In an article "On China's Communism," he said: "We feel that such a strategy of suppression and eradication of communism is the most fundamental, speediest and wisest means. This is the method of replacing one ideology with another which we have discussed." (New Moon, Vol. 3, No. 10) This clearly and unmistakably showed that what the "New Mooners" did was to make up for the inadequacy of the KMT military "encirclement and suppression" campaign with ideological "suppression and eradication of communism." Vigorous trumpeting of the bourgeois theory of human nature by Liang Shih-ch'iu and his like in an effort to break the people's "will to struggle" was just one tactic. But communist ideology was invincible, and under counter-attacks by Lu Hsün and the Left-wing literary and art forces which he led, the ideological weapon of "suppression and eradication of communism," on which the "New Mooners" depended for gaining favor from their masters, went bankrupt after only a few rounds. Completely routed, Liang Shih-ch'iu and his like could only bark angrily: "Call me a capitalist running dog? Which capitalist do I serve? Or do they mean all capitalists? I still do not know who my master is." ("Capitalist Running Dog")

Lu Hsün exposed Liang Shih-ch'iu and his like who viciously described their ideological opponents as communists and hinted that the KMT would arrest and execute them. "By this means, they hope to make up for the poverty of 'literary criticism'" and "are even more despicable than 'executioners'." Subjecting them to class analysis, Lu Hsün pointed out: They "do not know who their masters are because they are so docile and tame before all rich men, and this is proof that they belong to all capitalists. Even if they are kept by nobody, hungry and homeless, they are still docile and tame before all rich men and bark nastily at all poor men." They are out-and-out "homeless dogs," "useless running dogs of capitalists." ("Two Hearts: 'Homeless,' 'Useless Running Dogs of Capitalists'")

Hit back by the truth of Marxism, the bourgeois theory of human nature trumpeted by the "New Mooners," together with their "strategy of suppression and eradication of communism," became thoroughly bankrupt and their true features as running dogs of the Kuomintang were fully revealed. New Moon lasted as far as Vol. 4, No. 7, when it breathed its last and disappeared. Most of its principal members thereupon entered the reactionary regime controlled by the KMT and began their new counter-revolutionary career. As Lu Hsün pointed out, "'New Moon' has declined because all its

old members have 'climbed' upward and are farther away from the moon." ("Semi-Gay Life: Living by Preaching") As "useless running dogs" of the ruling class, they barked nastily for a while on the political stage of the old China, but swiped by Lu Hsün's big writing brush, their shameful deeds of fighting in the forefront of the cultural "suppression and eradication" campaign of the KMT reactionaries were forever recorded in history. However, the series of essays by Lu Hsün the communist criticizing the "New Mooners," inasmuch as they upheld and developed the viewpoint of class analysis and thoroughly exposed the bourgeois theory of human nature, added important chapters to the treasure house of Marxist-Leninist theory on literature and art.

Struggle Against "Literature of Nationalism"

Heavily battered by the Left-wing writers represented by Lu Hsün, the "New Mooners" who fought in the front of the counter-revolutionary cultural "encirclement and suppression" campaign were routed. Thereupon, the KMT reactionaries, besides wantonly arresting and slaughtering the revolutionary writers, began in 1929 to carry out "Party rule on culture." They called a "National Propaganda Conference," formulated the so-called "literary and art policy of the Three People's Principles," "ban all works of literature and art that are opposed to the Three People's Principles," including those "advocating class struggle," and attempted to keep the people's thought under control and arrest the spread of Marxism-Leninism.

In June 1930 the brothers Ch'en Li-fu and Ch'en Kuo-fu, chiefs of the CC secret service, made plans and gathered together a group of politicians, scoundrels, secret agents and reactionary men of letters to launch the so-called "nationalistic literature movement" to implement their "literary and art policy of the Three People's Principles." Principal members of the movement included P'an Kung-chan, leader of the CC Clique secret service and director of the bogus Shanghai Municipal Education Bureau, and Fan Cheng-po, head of the detective squad and concurrently head of the military law department of the bogus Woosung-Shanghai Garrison Command HQ. These hawks and hounds of the KMT reactionaries offered handsome rewards to those who drafted a "Manifesto of the Nationalistic Literary and Art Movement," and successively published a number of reactionary periodicals including Vanguard Weekly and Vanguard Monthly. They cried aloud that "class ideology in China may be said to be a deep pit into which the nation will fall and perish." (Chu Ta-hsin, "Mission of the Nationalistic Literary and Art Movement") And "the only way" to "overcome" this so-called "present crisis is to devote efforts to forming a central ideology in the course of evolution of a new literature and art" and publicize "the supreme significance of literature and art," which was the so-called "nationalism." ("Manifesto of the Nationalistic Literary and Art Movement")

Scarcely had "nationalistic literature" raised its head than it was severely battered by the revolutioary literary and art circles. Declarations and statements were issued many times by the League of Left-Wing Writers, exposing the counter-revolutionary nature and the underhand tricks of the "nationalistic literary and art movement." With the sharp scalpel of Marxism,

Lu Hsün thoroughly dissected the social background of the genesis of "nationalistic literature," pointed out its class essence and its inevitable doom, and unmasked its sponsors, dealing a destructive blow to the "vanguard" of the counter-revolutionary cultural "encirclement and suppression" campaign.

Lu Hsün observed that the appearance of the nationalistic literary movement was a result of class struggle. Owing to the "vigorous rise of the proletariat," the "increasingly apparent collapse of the old society" and "more and more acute struggles between classes," the "favorite boys of the colonial foreign masters," "the long drifting cadavers in the waters of Shanghai," had a premonition of their own impending doom. They "naturally gather around the standard of 'nationalistic literature' held by the tamed subjects in a nation dominated by imperialism, and make the final struggle together with their masters." ("Two Hearts: Mission and Fate of 'Nationalistic Literature'." All quotes in this section that are not identified are taken from this essay) Lu Hsün had the utmost contempt for these "knife brandishing" men of letters, pointing out that "if they write a book about 'killing people' or 'detective work,' they may have some readers, but unfortunately they want to paint pictures and write poetry." ("Two Hearts: The Present State of the Literary and Art Circles in Dark China") Naturally they could end up only in defeat. Thus he graphically depicted the fierce, brutal features of these "pet dog" men of letters. In the face of their destructive raids on bookstores, banning of publications, intimidation and murder of writers, and rampant fascist terrorist activities, Lu Hsün resolutely went about exposing and criticizing from the political point of view and class nature, powerfully hitting back at the combined "armed" and "literary" assaults of the KMT reactionaries.

The so-called "theory" of "nationalistic literature" was merely a hodgepodge of plagiarized fragments. The KMT reactionaries had long ago completely betrayed Sun Yat-sen's anti-imperialist nationalism and become agents of imperialist rule in China. Therefore, "nationalism" they advertised was in fact national betrayal and capitulationism to foreigners and obliteration of class struggle to the Chinese people. They said preposterously that promotion of class struggle would lead to national subjugation, and cried that "what modern China needs most is a literary and art movement with national consciousness as the central thought" (Fu Yen-ch'ang, "Literary and Art Movement With National Consciousness As the Core"), in the forlorn hope of replacing class consciousness with "national consciousness," negating the Marxist teaching of class struggle, and opposing the Chinese people's revolutionary struggle.

In class society, every nationality has always been divided into different classes, and there can never be a "national consciousness" without class content. "National consciousness" trumpeted by "nationalistic men of letters" was consciousness of landlords and the bourgeoisie willing to serve as henchmen to imperialism. It was from their class nature that Lu Hsün thoroughly exposed the reactionary substance of their "national consciousness" or "nationalism." He revealed that when they declared that there should be no class struggle among the yellow races, they meant to obey the

orders of Japanese imperialism and serve as its slaves and obedient subjects and help it oppress the people. Hence the so-called "nationalism" of the hawks and hounds of the Kuomintang was "basically closely related only to their foreign masters." Lu Hsün pointed out pointblank: They "have only one ultimate objective -- to kill people who oppose imperialism, that is, the government, the 'counter-revolutionaries,' or people who have only some grievances." "Like their masters, they oppress the proletariat by every means so as to delay their own end."

To expose even more fully the reactionary features of the "nationalistic men of letters," Lu Hsün cited as examples two works, "On the Lung-Hai Railway" and "Blood of the Yellow Man," by Huang Chen-hsia, a backbone of "nationalistic literature and art," when criticizing their ignominious anti-communist, anti-people activities that were closely linked with their foreign masters. Lu Hsün disclosed that in front of Japanese aggressors these self-styled "nationalistic" scoundrels wagged their tails fawningly for their masters' favors, willingly serving as slaves and henchmen of imperialism. From "Blood of the Yellow Man" to the later "Destruction of Greater Shanghai," what the "nationalistic men of letters" indulged in was a dream of "Sino-Japanese cooperation to fight jointly against communism." Their so-called "nationalism" was a doctrine of national betrayal in the full sense.

"Nationalistic literature" was an instrument by which the KMT reactionaries tried to dope the people. It was an exhaustive expression of their capitulationist and traitorous policy in literature. Buffeted by the high tide of nationwide resistance against Japan and opposition to Chiang, and heavily battered by Lu Hsün and the revolutionary literary and art circles which he represented, it succumbed in less than a year. Thus bankrupt was one more counter-revolutionary cultural "encirclement and suppression" campaign conducted painstakingly by the KMT reactionaries. While the White terror intensified day after day, Lu Hsün, filled with revolutionary fighting passion, handed down a judgment of history on the "nationalistic men of letters" and their masters, pointing out that they were only "dross" in the stormy sea of class struggle and like all past reactionaries, their "final fate will still be sinking down." ("Two Hearts: Surfacing of Dross") He firmly believed that the time would surely come when "the billows of proletarian revolution will roar to cleanse the mountains and rivers."

Struggle Against "Free Men" and "Third-Category Men"

Widespread dissemination of Marxism-Leninism in our country and the vigorous development of the Left-wing literary and art movement caused great alarm among KMT reactionaries and their running dogs. Because at that time "the so-called 'writers and artists' subordinated to the ruling class have already degenerated to such an extent that they cannot produce even works of so-called 'art for art's sake' or 'decadent' works," "the revolutionary literary and art movement of the proletariat is in fact the only movement of its kind." ("Two Hearts: The Present State of the Literary and Art Circles in Dark China") Faced with this situation, apart from continuing to oppose

Left-wing literature and art with slanders, oppression, imprisonment and murder, they hoisted the banner of "free men" and "third-category men," and some even used Marxist-Leninist quotes to madly oppose Marxism-Leninism and the Left-wing literary and art movement. Such roles were played by the so-called "free man" Hu Ch'iu-yüan and "third-category men" Su Wen, Yang Ts'un-jen, Shih Chih-ts'un and the like.

Toward the end of 1931, the Trotskyite Hu Ch'iu-yüan wrote "Puppy on Literature and Art" in the inaugural issue of Cultural Review which he published. In the guise of criticizing "nationalistic literature and art," he opposed leadership of literary and art enterprises by the proletariat as well as literature and art serving the cause of proletarian revolution. Taking the stance of an eclectic and fair-minded "free man," he cried that "literature and art will be free and democratic till the end of time," and viciously attacked the proletariat for "lowering art to the level of a political phonograph and being a renegade to art." Later he published such essays as "Don't Invade Literature and Art" and "Settling Account with Ch'ien Hsing-ts'un's Theory" in a wanton attack on Left-wing literature and art. After these fallacies were refuted by the Left-wing literary and art circles, Su Wen (Tu Heng), who held the banner of "third-category man," came out at once to defend Hu Ch'iu-yüan. In 1932 he published an essay, "On the Literary Debate Between 'Wen Hsin' and Hu Ch'iu-yüan," in which he launched an all-out attack on Marxism-Leninism and the Left-wing literary and art movement. Consequently a vehement verbal war ensued around the question of "freedom of literature and art." In this struggle, Lu Hsün, with his profound and forceful criticism, fully demonstrated the fighting spirit of a communist.

Lu Hsün was adept in politically unmasking the class essence of his opponents. Hu Ch'iu-yüan, calling himself a disciple of Plekhanov, advertised that "our method is materialist conception of history." ("Who Is the Evil Spirit That Leads the Tiger to His Prey?") To his essay, "Liquidation of Ch'ien Hsing-ts'un's Theory and Criticism of Theory of National Literature," which viciously attacked Marxism-Leninism, he even added a subtitle, "Support for Marxist Theory of Literature and Art." Su Wen in his "On the Literary Debate Between 'Wen Hsin' and Hu Ch'iu-yüan" also repeatedly quoted from Marx and Lenin and then misinterpreted them. Lu Hsün wrathfully excoriated them for such ignominious acts, exposing them to be nothing more than publicists who, protected by the sword of the military and displaying a 'Left-wing' signboard, discovered the theory of freedom of literature and art in Marxism and arguments for killing all 'communist bandits' in Leninism." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: On 'Third-Category Men'") With these few words he stripped them of their camouflage and sketched the true features of the running dogs of the ruling class. While the White terror of the Kuomintang enveloped the whole country, Left-wing writers were arbitrarily thrown into prison or killed and Left-wing periodicals were banned and persecuted, Hu Ch'iu-yüan and Su Wen nevertheless created the mirage of an arrogant Left-wing literary group and blamed the proletarian revolutionary literary and art movement for the non-appearance of the literature of so-called "free men" and "third-category men." They cried loudly that proletarian politics had invaded literature

and art and that the partisan principles of proletarian literature and art had interfered with their "freedom of creation." Accordingly, calling black white, they demanded "freedom of creation" from the proletariat and the Left-wing literary world. This was an extremely virulent move to whitewash and serve the KMT counter-revolutionary cultural "encirclement and suppression." In his "Ghosts and Evil Spirits in the Chinese Literary Garden," which he wrote in 1934, Lu Hsün straightforwardly exposed their devilish tricks.

Applying the viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism, Lu Hsün further expounded the relationships between literature and classes and between literature and politics, and hit back effectively at the fallacies of Su Wen and his like. The class-transcending view of literature and art was a weapon with which the bourgeoisie attacked the revolutionary literature and art of the proletariat. The "third-category men" claimed that they belonged neither to the bourgeoisie nor to the proletariat, and declared that "not all forms of literature have a class character." (Su Wen, "The Way Out for 'Third-Category Men'") In a tit-for-tat reply Lu Hsün criticized this so-called "impartial" stand of Su Wen and his like. Drawing a parallel between fatness and leanness of the human body, Lu Hsün showed that there were in fact no "third-category men" who were neither fat or lean because, "when compared to others, one is either nearer being fat or nearer being lean." This also applied to the "third-category men" in literature and art. "They incline in fact to one side. Though ordinarily this inclination is intentionally or unintentionally concealed, it will become apparent at some critical juncture." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Again on 'Third-Category Men'") For example, as the development of the proletarian revolutionary literary and art movement caused them to bark and finally to reveal their features as running dogs, so "a man born in a class society who wants to be a writer transcending classes, or born in a fighting age who wants to quit fighting and become independent, or born in the present who wants to write for the future" was "exactly like one who wants to lift himself from this earth by pulling his own hair," and "this is in fact only a mirage created out of the mind." In a class society, "no one can rise above class" or "quit fighting," or "skip over the present." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: On 'Third-Category Men'") Thus Lu Hsün effectively repulsed the enemy's attack under the banner of class-transcending literary and art outlook, and defended Marxism-Leninism.

Toward the end of 1932, the renegade Yang Ts'un-jen also rushed out with his essay "Raise the Flag of Petty Bourgeois Revolutionary Literature." In it he denounced the League of Left-Wing Writers for "attacking and harassing 'third-category men' writers," and called on "writers and youths who believe themselves to be 'third-category men' and are willing to engage in revolutionary literature to raise high the flag of our petty bourgeois revolutionary literature, form ranks and march" in order to boost the morale of Su Wen and his like. In "An Open Letter in Reply to Mr. Yang Ts'un-jen's Open Letter," Lu Hsün lashed out at Yang's renegade features, pointing out that his effort to transform himself into a "third-category man" was "in fact beneficial to the rulers." Once more he showed that in the severe class struggle there could never be room for the existence of so-called "third-category men."

In 1933, Shih Chih-ts'un, another leader from the "third-category men" camp, tried to peddle to young people Chuang Tzu, Anthology of Essays, and other ancient books in an attempt to lead them away from acute real struggle and into piles of musty tomes so as to wear away their fighting will and shackle their thought, so that they might serve the cultural "encirclement and suppression" campaign of the KMT reactionaries. Lu Hsün then observed promptly: "The question is not one that concerns only individuals; it is part of the thought-trend of the times." ("Semi-Gay Life: Missing the Target") He closely linked the cultural struggle with the political storm of the time.

It was with such tenacious fighting spirit that Lu Hsün carried out prolonged and profound criticism against the "third-category men." In his innumerable later miscellaneous essays, he sometimes concentrated on exposures and sometimes dealt out blows. In the essay "Speculation About Theatrical Masks," Lu Hsün revealed the essence of the so-called "perpetual neutrality" advertised by the "third-category men," so that they "show white noses." In his "Preface to Bumper Harvest by Yeh Tzu," on the basis of severe class antagonism in real life, he disclosed that by trumpeting "art for art's sake," the "third-category men" were covering up class contradictions and serving the reactionary rulers.

In 1934, Su Wen became a censor on the Committee for the Examination of Books and Magazines under the Kuomintang Central Committee. Backed by the tyranny of the Chiang imperial court, he, "holding the censor's pen and the power over life and death," "pulls hard at the legs of fellow writers already dangling from the hangman's noose," ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Ghosts and Evil Spirits in the Literary World of China") Hu Ch'iu-yüan, who gained prominence as an anti-communist, became a member of the Kuomintang "Legislative Yuan." Their reactionary career was the best footnote to the so-called "free men" and "third-category men."

In the verbal war Lu Hsün warned the Left-wing writers that they must heighten their vigilance, be good at analysis, and prevent the camouflaged enemy from "taking the opportunity to hurt, soften and misrepresent the revolution." He stressed again and again that Left-wing theorists must persevere in the fight, "draw a clear line between the opposing camps, and pull out the poisoned arrows shot at them from behind." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Again on 'Third-Category Men'") Such a high revolutionary principle was a splendid crystallization of his fighting experience. These valuable teachings from Lu Hsün are principles that must still be observed today in class struggle.

Criticism of Lin Yü-t'ang and Other Hanger-on Writers

Lu Hsün's criticism of Lin Yü-t'ang, Chou Tso-jen and other hanger-on men of letters may be traced back to 1925. In the famous essay "'Fair Play' Should Be Deferred," Lu Hsün criticized them for their reactionary sermons defending the tottering government of the Northern warlords and advocating desisting from beating dogs in the water. Citing bloody lessons, past and

present, he observed: "If it is a dog that bites, I think it should be beaten, no matter whether it is on land or in water," which expressed his uncompromising, thoroughly revolutionary spirit.

After the fall of the Northern warlords, Lin Yü-t'ang and his like gradually leaned toward the Chiang dynasty. After the "September 18" incident, Japanese imperialism became more and more aggressive and the national crisis deepened steadily. The Chiang Kai-shek government adopted a policy of compromise and capitulation toward foreign countries, and domestically intensified its counter-revolutionary military and cultural "encirclement and suppression" campaigns. The whole country smarted under the fascist White terror. Left-wing writers and artists represented by Lu Hsün waged a courageous, stubborn struggle against foreign and domestic forces of reaction, winning one victory after another on the ideological and cultural front. At this time, in accordance with the political needs of the KMT reactionaries, Lin Yü-t'ang, Chou Tso-jen and company writing leisurely, carefree short pieces about "human essence and soul," attacked the revolution and benumbed the nation's youth, falsely presenting a situation of peace and prosperity under the Kuomintang rule.

In 1932, Lin Yü-t'ang founded a fortnightly Lun Yü /Analects/. In April 1934, Human World, another fortnightly devoted to belles-lettres edited by him, appeared. In September 1935 he founded another periodical, Wind of the Universe. In these periodicals large numbers of so-called "small pieces of humor" were published in support of the "encirclement and suppression" campaign by the KMT reactionaries against the revolutionary literary and art movement.

Lun Yü promoted "humor" and "human essence and soul," while in its "inaugural message" Human World advocated "making the ego the center and leisureliness and light-heartedness the style," "so that everything, ranging from the large universe to a small fly, may be discussed." They hoisted the banner of bourgeois liberalism, but concealed an obvious murderous intent. In their writings Lin Yü-t'ang and Chou Tso-jen both made it clear that their so-called "human essence and soul" meant in effect advocating escape from struggle and reality, favoring reverence of Confucius and respect for Confucian scholars, and wilfully attacking Marxism-Leninism. In the "Editor's Postscript" to the inaugural issue of Lun Yü, it was announced at the start that the magazine was "more or less the same as the Analects of Confucius in style and content." In the second issue of the magazine Lin wrote a piece entitled "Wind of Marx," in which he disparaged, satirized and slandered the dissemination of Marxism-Leninism in China. Later, Lin extolled Confucianism, which he said was "the way to bring peace and tranquillity to the nation and the state." "It goes into the minds of the people far deeper than Marx, so its roots and arteries cannot be shaken." ("Satirical and Reverence of Confucius") Lin Yü-t'ang, vilifying the revolutionary literature of the proletariat, said preposterously that Left-wing writers could only shout slogans "Down with! Arise! Kill, kill, kill!" and "throw mud at others everywhere," so that "they are often unemployed, blame Heaven and man, and curse society as a whole." ("As a Writer and Man") Chou Tso-jen wrote "Old Man's Tomfoolery" for Wind of the Universe, in which he vilified Lu Hsün's defense and propagation of

Marxist ideas as "not being satisfied with his lot even when old, acting opportunistically and following the fashion." In another essay "Again on Fried Dumplings," he reversed the verdict on Ch'in K'uai /a historical traitor/ when the Japanese bandits were frantically invading China, and maliciously attacked Marxist propaganda as "unification of thought on the slavish pattern." Furthermore, in an article "Chiang Kai-shek Is Also One of the 'Lun Yü' School" carried in the second issue of Lun Yü, Lin Yü-t'ang fawned on this dictator and tyrant, crying, "hopefully all good-for-nothings and bookworms who follow others in proclaiming doctrines and shouting slogans will listen to Mr. Chiang and break their blind belief in these isms." He then had an article Soong Mei-ling wrote for a foreign magazine translated and carried in Human World. The article slanderously charged the Worker-Peasant Red Army with murder and arson and extolled the so-called "achievements" of the KMT reactionary military "encirclement and suppression" campaigns. Publication of such utterly reactionary writings starkly revealed the true colors of the running dog and accomplices. The so-called "humor" and "leisureliness and being carefree" were merely frauds.

Through "humor" and claiming to "see through everything" and "being capable not of anger but laughing" ("On Humor"), Lin Yü-t'ang and company in effect urged all to be slaves and docile subjects of the KMT reactionaries at a time when the national crisis was unprecedentedly grave and class struggle violent. Lu Hsün made a thorough analysis and criticism of this, stating that they "call all unctuousness, frivolity and obscenity 'humor'." ("Semi-Gay Life: 'Comic' Illustrated") But "where the wind-blown sand plasters one's face and wolves and tigers come out in packs" ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Crisis of the Causerie"), "where bombs fill the sky and the country is flooded by rising rivers" ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: 'One Year of Lun Yü'"), there was no "humor" to speak of. Hence Lu Hsün said: "There is no humor in China." ("Color Literature: New Lease of Life for the Causerie") He bitterly refuted their so-called "humor," which he said "reduces the brutality of the butcher to laughter among all and rings down the curtain to everyone's satisfaction." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: 'One Year of Lun Yü'") He exposed the crimes of these hanger-on men of letters, who were also criminal accomplices, saying that they "helped in leaving no bloodstains or the smell of blood in the scene of murder." He pointed out that the danger they posed was that they "create divisions everywhere, so even the most solemn words would lose some weight." ("Semi-Gay Life: Disclosing Hangering-On") Thus all war cries were drowned in laughter.

Literature is militant. Revolutionary essays are "the nerve center, the hands and feet in offense and defense" of the proletariat. ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Preface") It was by proceeding from the basic principles of proletarian revolutionary literature that Lu Hsün criticized such cliche as "leisureliness and being carefree" and "human essence and soul" promoted by Lin Yü-t'ang and associates. Lin vigorously extolled the "human essence and soul" of the causerie, saying preposterously that it "has nothing whatsoever to do with social ideology or the rise or fall of a state." ("Vestiges of the Causerie") He claimed that everyone

needed "the refined joys of amusement," babbling that "even in unbearable plight, a poor man still knows how to enjoy himself." ("Indulgence in Pleasures Will Not Cause Loss of Ambition") His criminal purpose was to dissuade people from making revolution and rebellion, and persuade them to be content with poverty and their lot, to allow themselves to be trampled on by the Japanese invaders, and to submit themselves to oppression and slaughter by the KMT reactionaries. Lin also made a model of Chou Tso-jen's writings, saying nonsensically that "When the 1930's are over, Chou's writings will still remain." ("Times and Men") Chou wrote innumerable short pieces which seemed to be ethereal and filled with "leisureliness and light-heartedness," and extolled by Lin, they were published in large numbers, poisoning the broad mass of readers. Lu Hsün thoroughly exposed the essence of these works, which was no more than an attempt to "grind the rough heart of man into something smooth by means of plaintive murmurings or frivolous outpourings." In particular, they wanted "young people to change their rough-grained character into something refined by meditating over these little morceaux" ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Crisis of the Causerie"), and tried to lead them away from struggle and revolution and into the quagmire of the bourgeoisie. That was why Lu Hsün commented: "Human World and its like are opiates." (Letter to Wu Po, February 14, 1935) "By reading Lun Yü or Human World exclusively for one or two years, one cannot avoid becoming waste material." (Letter to Cheng Chen-to, January 8, 1935)

To criticize Lin Yü-t'ang and associates in greater depth, Lu Hsün in such essays as "Buying 'Complete Primary School Education'" and "Rambling Thoughts After Bout With Illness," exposed from an even broader historical angle the inner ties between "human essence and soul" and so-called "the kingly way" and "benevolent government," and dug up the history of evolution of their so-called "human essence and soul." As in the case of those "wise scholar-officials" in history, their "preservation of human essence and soul" was no more than the Mencius-style hypocrisy of "virtuous men staying away from the kitchen." Their so-called "leisureliness and light-heartedness" was "found from bloodbath," the object of which was "not only singing hymns to peace and prosperity, but also covering up darkness." Comparing past and present, Lu Hsün fully exposed the features of this gang of criminal accomplices who were men of letters; and having grasped the ideological weapon of Marxism-Leninism, he became adept in grasping the class essence of things, analyzing their historical roots, and revealing their practical role. In this way he clearly showed the reactionary faces of Lin Yü-t'ang, Chou Tso-jen and their like. Chou later fell into the arms of the Japanese aggressors and became a big collaborationist, while Lin followed the Chiang dynasty and opposed communism to the end, both having completed their counter-revolutionary course.

In the struggle against Lin Yü-t'ang and his gang, Lu Hsün fully affirmed the splendid tradition and fighting role of the militant causerie. He pointed out solemnly: "The living causerie must be a dagger or a javelin, something that can open up, together with its readers, a bloody path to life."

("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Crisis of the Causerie") The miscellaneous essays Lu Hsün created, like daggers and javelins, demonstrated irresistible fighting power. The essays collected at that time in Southern Tone and Northern Tune, False Declaration of Freedom, Semi-Gay Life, Color Literature and later Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany are pages of a splendid record, showing how he, with the immense power of his vision and logic, revealed the decadence and brutality of the enemy, swept away old ideas, old culture, old customs and old habits, and stirred up anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-fascist political storms. While on historical subjects, he analyzed the festering sores and chronic diseases in real life, and from various facets of real life generalized the laws of class struggle, giving people enlightenment and strength and encouraging them to struggle and advance without cessation.

Criticism of the "New Life Movement" and Adverse Current of Reverence of Confucius and Returning to the Past

In February 1934, Chiang Kai-shek launched in Nanchang, headquarters of his 5th counter-revolutionary military "encirclement and suppression" campaign, a so-called "new life movement," the "central principle" of which was "propriety, righteousness, honesty, and a sense of shame," and established an "Association for the Promotion of the New Life Movement" with himself as president, thus activating the second adverse current of reverence of Confucius and restoration of the old since the founding of the Republic. Chiang Kai-shek blustered: "On the one hand, we are now suppressing the bandits in Kiangsi, and on the other hand we must make Kiangsi a base for national rehabilitation." With that end in view, he claimed that the "new life movement," which "conforms to the principles of propriety, righteousness, honesty and a sense of shame," was "a most fundamental and most effective" means. ("The Principles of the New Life Movement") Under vigorous promotion and coercion by the dictator and enemy of the people, Chiang Kai-shek, the number of counties in the KMT-controlled regions where "branches of Association for the Promotion of the New Life Movement" were established reached 1,133 by 1936.

The core of the "new life movement" was reverence of Confucius and returning to the past, extolling reactionary, decadent feudal morality and placing the broad mass of people under the yoke of feudal ideology so as to consolidate the fascist rule of the KMT reactionaries. Accordingly, the KMT reactionary government specially repaired the Confucian temple in Ch'üfu and designated Confucius' birthday a "national day of commemoration." Administrative and cultural-educational organs of the KMT reactionary government at all levels forced the introduction of reactionary education in reverence of Confucius and study of Confucian classics. Lu Hsün said: "This year's reverence of Confucius is the second grand ceremony since the founding of the Republic. Almost everything that can be done is done." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Not Knowing the Taste of Meat and the Taste of Water")

During the "May 4" period Lu Hsün already waged resolute struggle against Confucian thought, and now in view of the adverse current of restoration started by the KMT reactionaries, he was all the more resolute in taking the proletarian stand and applying Marxist teachings of class struggle in a severe and deep attack on the reactionary nature of the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius and the criminal object of Chinese and foreign reactionaries in revering Confucius. This was part of Lu Hsün's splendid achievement in opposing the KMT cultural "encirclement and suppression" and Japanese imperialist aggression during his 10-year stay in Shanghai.

Lu Hsün incisively exposed the fact that Chiang Kai-shek's promoting the "new life movement" and advocating reverence for Confucius and study of Confucian classics was intended to serve his anti-communist, dictatorial, traitorous counter-revolutionary political line. The basic object was to accommodate the invaders and to maintain and strengthen the fascist rule of the big landlords and big bourgeoisie on the proletariat and the working people. On the one hand, Chiang Kai-shek laid down such "new life" codes as "propriety, righteousness, honesty, a sense of shame," "pedestrians walk on the left side of the road," and "buttons should be held in place." On the other hand, he imprisoned and killed the innocent and had revolutionary base areas bombed and looted, doing everything brutal and cruel. In February 1934, when Chiang Kai-shek dished out his "new life movement," Lu Hsün wrote his famous indictment against the reactionaries, "On a Few Things About China." In it he observed that amid the din of "kingly way," enormous crimes were perpetrated by the Japanese imperialists who were engaged in frenzied aggression against China and by the Kuomintang reactionaries who used "fragmentation bombs" and "incendiary bombs" in their military "encirclement and suppression" campaigns against the revolutionary base areas. Lu Hsün said succinctly that "in reality, there has never been any kingly way in China," that Confucius propagated "kingly way" and "benevolent government" for the purpose of covering up the bloody rule of the slave-owning class over slaves, and that Japanese imperialists, Chiang Kai-shek and reactionary men of letters like Hu Shih, taking up the threadbare ware of the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius, also vigorously trumpeted "kingly way" and "benevolent government" in order to cover up the cruel reality of national oppression and class oppression. Lu Hsün said scathingly, "Old claims that there really had been a kingly way were lies; new claims that there is a kingly way is a new drug." In ancient times "a single recalcitrant man" was enough to "cut the ground completely from under the feet of the Chou Dynasty, the patriarchs and experts of the kingly way." Now prisons and reformatories that were spread all over China tore to pieces the fig leaf of the KMT's "kingly way." On the basis of Marxist-Leninist teachings about the state, Lu Hsün forthrightly exposed the grim fascist features of the Kuomintang who made use of such feudal teachings of "propriety, righteousness, honesty and a sense of shame" to imprison and kill the innocent. Thus he mobilized the masses for a struggle to smash this reactionary state machine.

Citing facts of acute class antagonisms, Lu Hsün also bitterly condemned the crimes of the KMT reactionaries in setting up rules of propriety and rituals and advocating reverence of Confucius and study of

Confucian classics on the one hand and in imposing extortionate taxes on the common people and persecuting them on the other. On August 27, 1934, KMT party and government dignitaries met at the Confucian temple in Shanghai to commemorate the birthday of Confucius, when the "music of Shao," which was said to have impressed Confucius so much that he "did not know the taste of meat" for three months after listening to it, was played with 40 kinds of ancient and modern instruments. On that same day, in Yüyao district, Chekiang, which was suffering from a severe drought, some people were beaten to death in a scuffle for water. Comparing these two events reported in newspapers, Lu Hsün ruthlessly exposed and caustically satirized the dark reality under the KMT rule. He said: "Listening to 'Shao' belongs to one world and being thirsty belongs to another. Being oblivious to the taste of meat belongs to one world and fighting for water to quench thirst belongs to another." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Not Knowing the Taste of Meat and the Taste of Water") The sharp contrast of the two "worlds" effectively punctured Chiang Kai-shek's scheme of erecting a facade of peace and fawning on the external enemy by "reverence of Confucius and study of Confucian classics."

Chiang Kai-shek was the biggest Confucius worshipper as well as the biggest traitor in China's modern history. Lu Hsün pointed out in depth that the KMT's object of revering Confucius amounted to anti-communism and national betrayal and suppression of the people, while the object of the imperialists in revering Confucius was to subjugate China. In the mid-1930's, the Japanese imperialists declared that their fascist act of aggression against China was for the sake of "restoring the teachings of Confucius." The reactionary man of letters Hu Shih also came out with a plan for the Japanese aggressors, who were asked first to "conquer the heart of the Chinese nation." Lu Hsün was extremely angered by the traitorous acts of Chiang Kai-shek, Hu Shih and the like. In his "Reckoning Accounts" he pointed out sharply: "Nothing is more important than revering Confucius and honoring Confucianism. Therefore, so long as one shows reverence for Confucius and respect for Confucianism, there is no harm in bowing one's head to any new dynasty. For the new dynasty, it has 'conquered the heart of the Chinese nation'." The KMT reactionaries betrayed the nation for their own gain and did not care whether the people lived or died; they "gained the restoration of the Confucian Temple, the rebuilding of Lei Feng Pagoda, the tabooing of man and woman walking together, the publication of Precious Editions From the Imperial Library, and other big face-saving devices at the cost of war, epidemics, floods, drought, wind storms and locust plagues." This showed that the heart of this gang of traitors was "really thoroughly conquered."

In his "Decline of the Foreign Dress" Lu Hsün, seizing the KMT reactionaries' promotion of the traditional Chinese gown and jacket in their "new life movement," vividly painted a portrait of the slave-like Chiang Kai-shek who "bowed respectfully" before the imperialists and "accepted meekly even humiliations, and naturally still more meekly favors." Another article entitled "Confucian Methods," through verification and discussion of the life of Yuan I-shan, showed how followers of Confucius and Mencius always made Confucianism a means of gaining favor and even used it to please alien

invaders. Lu Hsün said: "He who reads Analects and Book of Filial Piety will still be able to be a teacher even when taken prisoner and remain above other captives." The KMT reactionaries' advocating reverence of Confucius and study of Confucian classics was intended to prepare public opinion for their capitulation to Japanese imperialism because they knew "what is in store for them." Deeply exposing the capitulationist essence of Confucius worshippers, Lu Hsün explained that "Confucian methods" were in fact capitulationist tactics and "Confucian function" meant willingness to be slaves.

"Confucius in Modern China," which Lu Hsün wrote in 1935, is an important essay that sums up his other anti-Confucian works. At that time the Japanese imperialists had newly completed a Confucian temple in Tokyo, and invited K'ung Chao-jun, a "direct descendant" of Confucius, to Tokyo to attend the inauguration ceremony. From the Marxist viewpoint, Lu Hsün made a comprehensive study and observation of the reactionary role played by Confucius in history and dissected the basic reason why all reactionaries at home and abroad, ancient and modern, had such reverence for Confucius. Lu Hsün said: "Confucius devised outstanding ways of administering the government. But all these were for the benefit of power-holders to rule the people, there being none for the benefit of the people themselves." Therefore, he was "a sage to power-holders or those who wanted to hold power, and had nothing whatsoever to do with the masses of people in general." Thus from class essence the true colors of Confucius were uncovered.

On January 10, 1935, as the "new life movement" was going bankrupt, the so-called "10 great professors" of the CC Clique again came out and issued a "Declaration of Cultural Construction in China" (also known as "January 10 Declaration"), in which they bragged about the "new life movement." Lu Hsün, who clearly saw its essential weakness, thought that the professors were merely "making fun" to amuse themselves. When some people expressed approval for the "January 10 Declaration" and suggested that, in order to realize the spirit of the 'new life movement" for "national rejuvenation," the "Ministry of Education should order holding up the historical patriots Yüeh Wu-mu, Wen T'ien-hsiang and Fang Hsiao-ju as models," Lu Hsün contended that this "need not be seriously considered" nor "thoroughly studied" because if one "examines the facts about Yüeh Wu-mu and his like to see what they had achieved and whether they had 'brought national rejuvenation," one "would be so confused as to have a headache." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany No. 2: Making Fun") Lu Hsün had the utmost contempt for the "new life movement" which made so much noise for a time, and he saw right at the outset that it would soon go into oblivion. He said: "The new life is of course taken care of by the powerful government, and we common people need not join in the rumpus and bring trouble on ourselves." (Letter to Yang Chi-yün, February 4, 1935) Indeed on the occasion of the second anniversary of the "new life movement," Chiang Kai-shek lamented in his "commemorative address" that it "has not produced the results we expected." To preach like a mummy using new terms would necessarily end in failure. That is an historical fact, and also a law which Lu Hsün deduced from class struggle on numerous occasions.

Criticism of Idealism in the Realm of Aesthetics

The vehement struggle between cultural "encirclement and suppression" and counter-"encirclement and suppression" in the mid-1930's touched off continuous conflicts between idealism and materialism in the realm of literature and art. For example, there was at one time much talk about looking for "literary cultivation" in Chuang Tzu and Anthology of Essays, talk about promotion of "leisurely, carefree" and "egocentric" short essays and propagation of such aesthetic views as "quiet solemnity" and "aloofness from worldly things," etc. Lu Hsün carried out sharp criticism against these adverse currents of thought, profoundly exposing their reactionary essence and class roots. Of his criticisms concerning aesthetics, those against the idealistic viewpoint represented by Chu Kuang-ch'ien constituted Lu Hsün's important contribution to Marxist-Leninist aesthetics.

Chu Kuang-ch'ien put forward his idealist view of aesthetics during the very acute class struggle of the 1930's. Back in the 1920's, Chu as a "teacher of young people," wrote "12 Letters to Young People," in which he opposed distinguishing between "right and wrong, good and evil," repudiated "reason," and advocated "calmness" and "detachment," in an effort to lead young people away from the class struggle that was going on violently at that time. Then in 1932 he published a book On Beauty, also named The 13th Letter to Young People, in which he systematically advertised his idealist aesthetic thought. In the "Preface," he said that the darkness and corruption under the KMT reactionary rule did not mean that this criminal system was bad, but because "people are morally too bad." The common people sought only to warm their bodies and fill their stomachs; "unable to break away from customs," they had no "high, pure aspirations," lacking "a cultured sense of beauty." Therefore, when he "at this critical juncture between life and death" "discusses beauty because no time must be lost," he practically admitted that the subject he was talking about was not a viewpoint of art, but had a clear-cut political objective. Didn't the fact that under the dark, savage oppression of the KMT reactionaries, Chu put forward his idealist view of aesthetics and urged people to "begin with 'relaxation and cultivation of mental poise'," to "seek beauty in life before purification of the mind" and put aside "gain and loss" mean that he wanted to substitute "cultivation of the sense of beauty" for acute class struggle and use idealism to oppose Marxism?

Chu's "On 'The Song Ends, Everyone Is Gone; Only A Few Green Peaks Remain above the River," which Lu Hsün criticized with emphasis, was just such a representative piece. Here Chu highly extolled "the intangible mysticism" of "a fine phrase," and claimed that "quiet solemnness" was the "highest state of art." Applying the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint, Lu Hsün profoundly commented on the class character of beauty. He pointed out sharply: making "quietude" a "panacea that brings relief to the working people" was only theorizing and utopian. In fact, the so-called "quietude" could only be appreciated by "men of letters who linger between existence and non-existence, life and destruction." In the acute class struggle, those people "do not like the bustle and hustle of life yet are averse to leaving it. They are too lazy to make a living yet do not relish death. To them material life is too

stereotyped, but absolute quiet is too empty. They are tired and want rest, but rest is too depressing. Therefore they must have something to console themselves." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany No. 2: Draft of 'Title Not Yet Decided' 6-9". All unidentified quotes in this section are taken from this essay.) They wanted to seek from "quietude" "sudden, thorough enlightenment" and a "sense of return to one's Creator," not only to console themselves, but also to "lead readers astray" and make them leave or forget the reality of the fiery class struggle. After such "sudden, thorough enlightenment," the "mind" would naturally change, and they would "quietly and solemnly" become the subject people and captives of the reactionary ruling class. "The highest state in art" was for the ultimate political goal, and they naturally would become accomplices in the counter-revolutionary cultural "encirclement and suppression."

Pursuing this theme further, Lu Hsün demonstrated that beauty had a class character in class society. He always opposed art that was artifically wrought, fine and delicate, ethereal, or exaggerated and occult, but highly esteemed art which was powerfully grand, rough, strong and healthy, new and fresh. He opposed the aesthetics of "so-called skill and simplicity, quietude, solemnity, seclusion and remoteness," ("Ch'ieh-chieht'ing Miscellany, Last Collection: Preface by Pai Mang to 'Pagoda of Babies'") because he thought these would paralyze the fighting will. He held that while wind-blown sand plastered one's face and wolves and tigers came out in packs, what was needed was rugged, fighting beauty, a solid, grand structure that could withstand the sandstorm, sharp and practical daggers and javelins, "something that can open up, together with its readers, a bloody path to life." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Crisis of the Causerie") From his astute discussions of the history of Chinese and foreign literature, Lu Hsün showed that "none of the great writers in history were 'all quiet and solemn'." So he pointed out sharply that by artificially establishing "quietude" as "the ultimate state of poetry" and "the highest state of art," Chu Kuang-ch'ien would necessarily judge all works of literature by such metaphysical means, and sink into the "blind alley" of idealist aesthetics.

In regard to such metaphysical nonsense that made so much of "quiet solemnity," Lu Hsün, from the plane of Marxist dialectics, stated pointedly: "In discussing the merit of a literary work, it is better to consider the work as a whole and the author as a person as well as the social condition in which he lives -- this is the only way to arrive at correct, more definite conclusions." Lu Hsün was for all-round observation and for a firm grasp of the social and class origins in such observation, for this would radically destroy the foundations of Chu Kuang-ch'ien's metaphysical, idealist view of aesthetics. This immutable truth of Marxism Lu Hsün deduced from his combat has become our important weapon in identifying and criticizing bourgeois reactionary thought.

While criticizing Chu's view of "quiet solemnity," Lu Hsün made an incisive exposition of the materialist concept of aesthetics. He held that beauty was a reflection of social being, that all art was produced and existed in accordance with the needs of social life and struggle, and that

art was an expression of class utilitarianism. When translating and introducing works on the Marxist view of art in 1930, Lu Hsün made a profound summing-up of the materialist view of aesthetics. He said: "Man looked at things and phenomena from the utilitarian point of view at the very beginning, and it was later that he shifted to the aesthetic point of view. All things that men thought beautiful were things useful to him -- things of significance to his struggle for existence against nature or other forms of social life." "If there is no usefulness at the root of the pleasure of beauty, then there will be no beauty in things." ("Two Hearts: Preface to Translation of 'On Art'") And it was on this basis that Lu Hsün criticized the idealist view of aesthetics. He cited the bronze tripod of the Chou Dynasty as an example in criticizing "quiet solemnity" as an absolute criterion of beauty. He said: "The tripod in the Chou Dynasty was like the rice bowl today.... There was no reason why it should not be washed all year round. So in those times a tripod had to be clean and shining." These ancient utensils, now objects of art, were not "quiet and solemn" in their time, but kept rather "busy." Lu Hsün vividly showed with this example that in class society all art was "useful," being produced in social life and class struggle, and profoundly revealed the basic principles of materialist aesthetics concerning the class and utilitarian character of beauty. Thus Chu Kuang-ch'ien's absolute, unchangeable criterion of beauty fell through. It follows that "gain and loss," which Chu wanted to "discard," actually always existed, and his advocacy of such view was completely hypocritical, his aim being to abolish proletarian revolutionary struggle.

Lu Hsün's criticism of Chu Kuang-ch'ien's idealist view of aesthetics appropriately reveals its political content, defends Marxist materialist dialectics, and expounds in the course of combat the aesthetic principles of Marxism. Although this forms only part of Lu Hsün's overall aesthetic thought, nevertheless it will always enlighten upcoming fighters.

Defense of Chairman Mao's Proletarian Revolutionary Line

In October 1935, the Red Army triumphantly arrived in northern Shensi after its Long March. "As soon as the Long March ended, a new situation began." In December the Party Central Committee called a meeting of the Political Bureau at Wayaopao. Subsequently, on the basis of the resolution of that meeting, Chairman Mao made a report, "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism," at a meeting of Party activists. Chairman Mao analyzed the new situation in which the Japanese aggressors wanted to turn China into a Japanese colony and the trends of various classes in Chinese society, and put forward a complete line, principles, policies and tactics for the anti-Japanese national united front. He not only opposed "Left" closed-doorism and called for "organizing millions and millions of the masses to form a mighty revolutionary army" to join the anti-Japanese national united front, but also opposed Right capitulationism and firmly insisted on independence, upholding the leadership role of the Communist Party in the united front and

stressing the utter importance of proletarian leadership. He pointed out that the formation of the anti-Japanese united front had "increased the responsibility of the Communist Party for criticizing its allies, exposing pseudo-revolutionaries, and winning leadership." It was a Marxist-Leninist line.

Lu Hsün, sharing the life of the Party, showed constant concern for Chairman Mao and the condition of the Party Central Committee. When he learned of the Red Army's triumphant arrival in northern Shensi under Chairman Mao's leadership after a long march of 25,000 li, he sent a telegram to Chairman Mao and the Party Central Committee, saying, "On you are pinned the hopes of China and of mankind." (Selection of Lu Hsün's Statements, People's Literature Publishing House) In April 1936, when great leader Chairman Mao's report, "On Tactics Against Japanese Imperialism," reached Lu Hsün in Shanghai, he consciously geared his struggle and activities to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, being happy and proud to be able to join in the fight with his pen and serve as "a little soldier of the Party" on the ideological and cultural front. (Hsü Kuang-p'ing, "Memories of Lu Hsün") Lu Hsün was already very ill at that time, but he fought on as long as he breathed. He fought to the last moment of his life against Right capitulationism and in defense of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line.

In early 1936, without serious discussion among members of the League of Left-Wing Writers and without Lu Hsün's concurrence, Chou Yang and his associates dissolved the League behind Lu Hsün's back and formed an "Association of Writers and Artists." Lu Hsün's idea was that the united front of literary and art circles should be enlarged, but the League of Left-Wing Writers should be kept intact as the core of the united front, for without this core the united front would not be able to play its role but fall into the hands of others. But Lu Hsün's idea was rejected.

Chou Yang, who followed Wang Ming from first to last and first carried out Wang Ming's "Left" opportunist line, now fanatically carried out Wang Ming's Right capitulationist line. After reading Wang Ming's article "On the Revolutionary Movements in Colonies and Semi-Colonies and the Tactics of the Communist Party," Chou Yang put forward the slogan "literature of national defense" following his dissolution of the League of Left-Wing Writers. From the Right opportunist stand Wang Ming explained the problems of the anti-imperialist united front, loudly sang the hackneyed tune of "common interests of the whole people," abolished the Party's principle of independence, abandoned the proletarian leadership, trumpeted class capitulationism, and whitewashed the KMT reactionaries in an attempt to turn the Communist Party into an appendage of the KMT reactionaries. Chou Yang's "national defense literature," laid down according to this tune of Wang Ming's, was a thoroughly bourgeois slogan. In a tit-for-tat manner Lu Hsün put forward the slogan "mass literature of national revolutionary war" in accordance with Chairman Mao's policy on the anti-Japanese national united front. Chou Yang and his gang regarded this proletarian slogan as an attempt to "set up something new and different" and attacked Lu Hsün. The result was a vehement verbal war on "two slogans."

This controversy was an acute expression on the literary and art question of the two-line struggle in the Party, a struggle between bourgeois and proletarian ideologies on the literary and art front. Its focal point was this: Whether the proletariat should firmly hold or abandon its leadership in the united front, and whether it should develop class struggle.

Chou Yang said: "National defense literature" was "literature of the whole Chinese nation" ("On National Defense Literature") and had a "national character." ("Literature at the Present Stage") This completely ran counter to the Marxist method of class analysis and abolished class struggle in conformity to the interests of the big landlords and big bourgeoisie. Chou Yang and his gang nakedly opposed the firm policy of the proletariat "demanding leadership," and said nonsensically that it would "frighten away comrades-in-arms of other classes" and was "therefore erroneous and harmful to the united front." What Chou Yang and his gang carried out was a thoroughly capitulationist line. During the debate, the big renegade Liu Shao-ch'i, writing under the pseudonym of "Mo Wen-hua," produced one after another three articles, "The People's Front of National Liberation," "The People's Front and Closed-Doorism" and "The Significance of the Current Debate on Literature and Art as I See It," willfully publicizing the Right capitulationist line and betraying the revolutionary principles of the proletariat. The anti-communist old hand and Trotskyite Ch'en Po-ta also rushed out to defend Chou Yang; in the article "There Should Be a Truce on the Question of Two Slogans in Literary Circles," he cried loudly, on the one hand, that "the slogan 'national defense literature' cannot be refuted" and declared, on the other, that there should be a "truce" in the debate on big right and big wrong. They were alike in this respect: both were afraid of offending Chiang Kai-shek and the KMT reactionaries and peddled Right capitulationism.

During the debate Lu Hsün wrote "Reply to a Letter from Trotskyites" and "On Our Current Literary Movement." While he was gravely ill he wrote, during August 3-6, a fighting declaration, "Reply to Hsü Mao-yung and On the Question of the Anti-Japanese United Front." These three essays, glittering with the light of Marxist-Leninist theory, fully embody the new development of Lu Hsün's thought. Lu Hsün fully discussed his fervent love for the Party and Chairman Mao as well as his correct views on the anti-Japanese united front; he profoundly criticized both the "Left" and Right opportunist lines and penetratingly analyzed the historical progress of revolutionary struggle. He said: "The mass literature of national revolutionary war is a development of proletarian revolutionary literature, factual and broader in content at the present time." It essentially reflected the special features of the times and the demand of the proletariat and the masses on literature. The putting forward of this new slogan "does not mean that revolutionary literature will relinquish its class leadership responsibilities. But on the contrary it adds to the weight and magnitude of these responsibilities to the extent of making the whole nation, regardless of class and party affiliations, unite to fight external foes. Only such a national stand is really the class stand." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany, Last Collection: On Our Current Literary Movement") Lu Hsün paid constant attention to the

question of the proletariat's control of leadership, because only when leadership was firmly in the hands of the proletariat could victory be won in the revolutionary undertaking. Lu Hsün was great because, having become a communist, he always made classes and class struggle the starting point of observing and dealing with any problem and always placed the question of proletarian leadership in the most prominent and important position.

Opposing Chou Yang and his gang for their concentrating on unity to the neglect of struggle, Lu Hsün held that within the anti-Japanese united front of literary and art circles, "we may still criticize one another on literary questions." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany, Last Collection: Reply to Hsü Mao-yung and On the Question of the Anti-Japanese United Front") He positively clung to the stand of combining unity with struggle, so that the two achieved dialectical unity.

During the vehement debate on two slogans, Chou Yang and company falsely accused Lu Hsün of being a "Left sectarianist," "Trotskyite," etc. Taking advantage of the attack on Lu Hsün by Chou Yang and his gang, the Trotskyites malignantly wrote to Lu Hsün in hopes of driving a wedge between Lu Hsün and the Party, and assuming an ultra-"Left" stance, opposed Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line. If it was said Chou Yang and company attacked Lu Hsün from the Right, then the Trotskyites attacked him from the "Left." Lu Hsün bitterly lashed out at the despicable scheme of the Trotskyites, pointing out that their acts were "welcomed by the Japanese invaders" but "contrary to the morals of the Chinese as a people." With great fervor he sang the praises of Chairman Mao and his proletarian revolutionary line. He said: "I am honored to call those my comrades who practically and on firm ground fight and shed their blood for the present existence of the Chinese people." Having exposed the underhand schemes and tricks of the Trotskyites, Lu Hsün warned others against the danger of degenerating into collaborationists and traitors, pointing out that they might "fall into the most filthy spot on earth." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany, Last Collection: Reply to a Letter from Trotskyites") Chairman Mao highly assessed this political farsightedness on Lu Hsün's part.

The path of Lu Hsün's whole life eloquently shows that to persevere in making revolution and carrying it through to the end, it is necessary for one to study and master Marxist-Leninist theory, firmly and resolutely carry out Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, and continuously reform and improve oneself in struggle. Only in this way can one consistently stand in the van of the times and push history forward. Chairman Mao said: "Lu Hsün was the most correct, most courageous, most resolute, most faithful, and most ardent national hero without parallel who, representing the great majority of the whole nation on the cultural front, stormed the enemy positions. Lu Hsün's direction is the direction of China's new culture." Reading Lu Hsün's works and "emulating Lu Hsün's example" is of great practical significance to our further criticism of Teng Hsiao-p'ing's counter-revolutionary revisionist line today, to our hitting back at the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, defense of Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line, and consolidation and development of the victories of the great proletarian cultural revolution. We must make class

struggle the key link, firmly persevere in continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, firmly uphold the Party's basic line, oppose and prevent revisionism, and carry the socialist revolution through to the end.

* * *

Lu Hsün On "Nameless Ones"

by

Hsü Huai-chung (许怀中), Sun T'eng-fang (孙腾芳) and Liu Tsai-fu (刘再复)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 3, June 20, 1976)

History Is Made by Nameless People

By whom is history made? Is it made by heroes or slaves? Over this question, historical materialists and historical idealists have carried on prolonged, vehement debates.

The great thinker Lu Hsün had thought about this question for a long time, and when he grasped Marxism, he finally gave a completely scientific answer to it. Historical materialism holds that "slaves made history." In his unique way and using rich materials, Lu Hsün affirmed and demonstrated this great, universal truth!

In 1933, Lu Hsün pointed out most explicitly: "All forms of culture were gradually formed over the ages by nameless people. This is true of architecture, cooking, fishing, hunting and farming; it is also true of medicine." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Experience")

The nameless ones Lu Hsün referred to are the millions upon millions of working masses in the long river of history!

History is made by the nameless masses, but thinkers of the exploiting classes, putting history upside down, have always claimed that heroes, outstanding individuals, sages and "famous scholars" created this world. This is a biased view of the exploiting classes. Lu Hsün said: "Most Chinese scholars think that all knowledge must have come from sages or at least from scholars. Even the invention and use of fire and herbal medicine had nothing to do with the common folks, but were the work of ancient sage-kings: Sui Jen and Shen Nung." ("Color Literature: Having Known the World")

Lu Hsün resolutely refuted such an idealistic conception of history, pointing out clearly: "To attribute everything to a sage is pure speculation." (Outline History of Chinese Literature) Adopting a view directly opposite to the traditional ideas of historical idealism, Lu Hsün held that all civilizations in the world were wholly created by nameless people. "Wholly" means that they were not created jointly by heroes and the masses of people. And "all" means the creation not only of material wealth but also of spiritual wealth.

From various facets such as the history of literature, the history of science and the history of development of production, Lu Hsün proved effectively the materialist view of history that it was the nameless people who created the world. The following are a few examples:

On the creation of the written language. Lu Hsün pointed out in 1926: "The creation of our written language was accomplished over a long period of time, and it gained currency only after many people had worked on it and understood it." (Outline History of Chinese Literature) In 1934, he again said, "The written word took shape among the people." It was created gradually after many generations and after passing through the hands of many people, and gained currency as an instrument only after it was understood and used by the masses. Thus the written language was created by people whose names had been "forgotten" long ago, and certainly not by the ancient sage Ts'ang Chieh who was reputed to have "four eyes." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Layman Talks About Literature")

On the genesis and development of literature: Lu Hsün pointed out, "Man had already begun to create literature before he had a written language, but unfortunately his creations were not recorded." For example, when men were working together as in carrying a heavy log, someone might cry, "Hei-yo, hei-yo!" if only to enable them to keep in step with one another. That was the first song sung by the nameless "Hei-yos" in their struggle with Nature. The nameless people not only created culture, but also developed the history of culture. Lu Hsün pointed out, in the world treasury of literature and art there were many fine works by anonymous authors. For instance, of our ancient folk songs "many were created by anonymous illiterates, and because these songs were relatively outstanding, they were handed down orally" and then recorded and preserved. Lu Hsün summed up a regular phenomenon "often seen in the history of literature," which was that when an old literature declined, writers would have recourse to folk literature by "assimilating (anonymous works) in their own as a new form of nutrient," and so enabling literature "to take a new turn." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Layman Talks About Literature")

On the creation of medicine. Lu Hsün held that medicines were not "discovered by an Emperor Shen Nung alone by testing herbs," but were a result of accumulated experience of the masses in long ages of practice. When ancient people fell ill, "at first they tried some of this and some of that. When they tried what was poisonous they died; when they tried something indifferent it failed to cure them; when by chance they tried something that cured their illness, they knew that that something was good for their particular illness." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Experience") Lu Hsün said that when the herbalist wrote "Arsenic, severe poison," he certainly knew that it had already killed many lives.

On culinary work. Cooking, among the four essentials of clothing, food, housing and travel, was also gradually developed by the nameless working masses. Lu Hsün said, "Many historical lessons

were learned at enormous sacrifices. Take for example the things we eat. Some are poisonous and must not be eaten, and we know and refrain from eating them. But that knowledge must have been gained at the cost of many lives before." Crabs are fierce-looking, ugly creatures, but we discovered that their meat is very tasty only through practice. Lu Hsün commended "the first men to eat crabs as admirable" "warriors." ("Omissions: Two Thoughts This Spring")

Lu Hsün's writings tell us that it is the courage and wisdom of the working people, their ceaseless production practice, that brought mankind civilization(written language, literature), health (medicine), and the bases (i.e., architecture, culinary art, farming, etc.) on which depend the existence and development of all spiritual and cultural activities of mankind. Without the nameless working masses, without these creators of spiritual and material wealth, how can history advance and develop? Confounding right and wrong, historical idealists slander the masses as "ignorant mobs." Lu Hsün rebuked them, saying, "It is the ignorant who created the world. Wise men surely cannot support the world!" ("The Tomb: Postscript to 'The Tomb'") Isn't this an unshakable truth?

Lu Hsün saw not only that nameless people were the creators of material and spiritual wealth, but also that class struggle waged by them was the motive force that drove history forward. In his early years Lu Hsün's view of history was still historical evolutionism. He was still unable to see the great role played by the masses in history. He saw history as a metabolic process in which the new continued to vanquish the old, and realized that society could make progress only through continuous revolution. However, he was not clear about what the leading force was that drove society forward. So, before he grasped Marxism, Lu Hsün underestimated the strength of the masses, as he once said: "The masses--particularly the Chinese--are always the spectators of drama." ("The Tomb: What After the Departure of Nora") Therefore, any reform must "begin with the educated class....by working out ways on the one hand, while the masses will have to wait until some other time." ("The Canopy: Newsletter") In his later years Lu Hsün completely changed this concept. He thought that in order to seek China's revolutionary strength, "it won't do to read the writings of premier scholars and prime ministers," and one must "look at the ground underneath oneself." Then one could see "the spine of China," that is, those revolutionary nameless masses who "work with perspiration." They had confidence and would not deceive themselves. Although they were always persecuted and ignored, they would always unyieldingly "fight on regardless of losses." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Have the Chinese Lost Their Self-Confidence?") In this period, Lu Hsün used to refute, uncompromisingly and severely, all fallacies that regarded the great role of the masses with contempt. When someone disparagingly called the masses a "tray of loose sand," Lu Hsün criticized such a view, saying that the "loose sand" situation was only the "accomplishment" of the rulers, while the masses were capable of fighting in unity. "The lowly people may be uneducated and may not be able to see things clearly, but they will unite when they know where their interests are involved." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Sand") In 1932, Su Wen (also known as Tu Heng), who called

himself a man of the third category, jumped out to oppose the class character of literature and art and its popularization. He likened the Chinese masses to those portrayed by Shakespeare in Julius Caesar, saying that they were all ignorant riffraffs who would "reverently greet a rooster or dog when one comes." Furious, Lu Hsün lashed out at this view, saying that even in ancient Rome, "there might have been masses who were intelligent, who had clear views of what was good and what was bad, and whose emotions were not controlled or manipulated by a few demagogs, but they were dispersed, suppressed, and slaughtered." ("Color Literature: It's 'Shakespeare' Again") Pointing his accusing finger at Tu Heng and other detractors of the masses, Lu Hsün said: Even if the masses were "impotent," they were a hundred times stronger than you roosters and dogs of the reactionary class!

Lu Hsün had special praise for the working people in Chinese history, who were most resolute in the struggle against the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius that blocked the progress of history,and who became the main force in the criticism of Confucius. He said, "China's masses in general, and the 'stupid' ones in particular" were most able to see through the essence of the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius and spurn them. Lu Hsün evaluated them highly, saying, "I am afraid there are no other people in the world who know Confucius as well as China's ignorant people." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany 2: Confucius in Modern China") He also said, "....There are wise ones even among the ignorant. They have seen through this double game long ago. That is why the old saying goes: 'benevolence, righteousness, propriety and wisdom on the lips, men as robbers and women prostitutes in heart!" ("The Tomb: On 'To Hell with You'") This old saying of nameless ones glaringly exposes the nature of Confucian swindlers.

It is not strange that the nameless masses play a decisive role in class struggle. At the cost of numerous bloody lessons, they learned the laws of class struggle. For example, the proverb "The doors of yamen are open, but unless you have money, don't go inside even though justice is on your side," reflects gradual understanding by the nameless ones of the nature of reactinary governments in the course of class struggle and reveals the fundamental antagonism between the reactionary state machine of the exploiting classes and the working people. Such knowledge was gained through "great sacrifices" and at a "striking price." With facts, Lu Hsün pointed out that while the Japanese imperialists were driving deeper and deeper into China, the Kuomintang reactionaries adopted a capitulationist policy of non-resistance and tried to deceive the public with high-sounding phrases. But the people did not believe them. No matter how the Kuomintang reactionaries couched their "declarations, telegrams, speeches and talks" in "lofty and noble terms," people were not taken in. This knowledge about the reactionaries was gained by the masses after "sacrifice of vast tracts of territory and the lives and property of a large number of people." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Experience")

Lu Hsün's writings show clearly that the nameless masses who "advance wave after wave," "work with perspiration" and dare to "rebel" are the main force of class struggle and social revolution. Since the

disintegration of primitive society, the metabolic changes of production relations and social systems, the substantial development of production, and the ceaseless progress of history were made possible only by the class struggle and social revolution carried out by these nameless masses! They are the real heroes who create history and push history forward!

The Nameless Ones Are the Wisest

Lu Hsün's scientific knowledge of the nameless masses is also demonstrated in his profound realization that the nameless masses, who for hundreds of years were called "the ignorant rabble" by the ruling classes, were exactly the wisest and the most intelligent, whereas the so-called "sages" and "persons of renown" often belied their names and proved themselves most foolish.

Lu Hsün reminded people again and again that they must break the "theory that scholars of renown know best" and their blind faith in famous persons. He put forward an important idea, which was that persons of renown should not be confused with renowed sayings. He said, "We should separate 'statements by persons of renown' from 'renowned sayings.' Not everything a person of renown says is a renowned saying, but many a renowned saying came from the mouth of rustics." ("Ch'ienchieht'ing Miscellany 2: Persons of Renown and Renowned Sayings") Lu Hsün noted that society respected persons of renown, believing that their word must be a "renowned saying." This was a blind faith, he said. He realized deeply that the poisonous influence of this blind faith was "more serious in China" than elsewhere, and efforts ought to be made to get rid of it.

Lu Hsün pointed the edge of criticism at all types of reactionary "scholars of renown" who were exalted and elevated out of the political needs of the reactionary ruling classes. Confucius, this No. 1 person of renown elevated to the status of a sage by reactionary classes through the ages, was in fact a man of no great ability, one who was lazy with his limbs and who could not tell one kind of cereal from another. He subsequently became so famous, said Lu Hsün, entirely because he was "exalted by those in power." His title as a "sage" was bestowed on him by later rulers entirely out of the needs of their own rule. They "made him up with all kinds of white powder and elevated him to a frightening height." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany 2: Confucius in Modern China") Through Confucius' false appearance as "the embodiment of great accomplishments," Lu Hsün saw his trivial, bad qualities.

"Sage K'ang," who later became leader of the Confucian Society, was also a man of illustrious fame but little substance. Lu Hsün once portrayed him thus: "K'ang Yu-wei, the sage of Nanhai, was a preeminent person. He toured 11 countries and all the way to the Balkans, when he finally realized why there were frequent cases of 'regicide' in foreign countries. He said, 'It was because the palace walls were too low.'" (Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Proverbs") Is "regicide" a manifestation of class struggle, or is it due to the palace walls being too low? This is

not a question too difficult to answer. Yet the preeminent "Sage K'ang" came up with such a preposterous idealistic answer, and this completely exposed his ugly features as an ignoramus.

Among those unmasked in large numbers by Lu Hsün were reactionary "scholars of renown" Hu Shih and Ch'en Hsi-ying, bourgeois comprador men of letters. They assumed the stance of "professors" and "scholars," regarded themselves as persons of renown and unabashedly called themselves "mentors of the young." In the 1920's, with these gilded signboards, they lured young people away from practical struggle and into "research rooms," to seek fame and gain and play the role of criminal accomplices of the Northern warlords. Later, these "persons of renown," assuming the pompous guise of "authorities," excluded the worker-peasant masses, did their utmost to monopolize the realm of literature and art, and worked in collaboration with the Kuomintang reactionaries in their counter-revolutionary "encirclement and suppression" campaign in the cultural domain. Seeing through the masks of these "scholars of renown" as swindlers, Lu Hsün pointed out that they were merely small compradors, saying, "Prof. Dewey has his experimentalism and Prof. Babbitt his humanism. Some people bought fragments from them and came home to become scholars loudly critical of others." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Let Us Try Lowering Ourselves One Grade") Under the obnoxious influence of Hu Shih and the like, an evil wind of worshipping "persons of renown" rose in society at that time. People tried to win fame by all means. The obnoxious practice of praising oneself and extolling one another, as well as buying long and selling short, prevailed in the world of literature and art. Lu Hsün pointed out: "As a result of many years of phoney deals, the literary world has become more and more desolate." "Writers gain fame quickly through buying positions and extolling one another, but because too much air is blown into their own bellies, they become bloated and the emptiness inside becomes all the more apparent." ("Semi-Gay Life: From Deaf To Dumb") With the firm stand of the proletariat, Lu Hsün swept away this evil wind and air. He said, "The so-called scholars of renown are only nominally such. In reality they are empty, and their works are below those of even nameless, insignificant writers." ("To Yang Chi-yün, May 6, 1934") These multi-colored "scholars of renown" wearing all sorts of laurel crowns are in fact only "embroidered pillows" filled with "straw, not eider down," and we must not be deceived by them. ("Color Literature: 'Flying Snow Flakes'")

While ripping off the masks of "persons of renown" of the reactionary classes, Lu Hsün praised the high degree of wisdom and creative spirit of the nameless ones with great proletarian warmth, and rated them highly. At the start of the "January 29" movement, when student demonstrators in Peking were suppressed by the military and the police, the local people organized comfort teams to give the students support and encouragement. Lu Hsün commented on this with admiration: "The common people have not studied the classics, do not understand history and law, and do not know how to find fault in perfection or seek the way in a dung heap, but they look at things in correct perspective, are able to distinguish black from white and

right from wrong in a way often beyond the reach of the lofty, well-bred and well-educated scholar-officials. ....Who says that China's common people are vulgar and foolish? They have good judgment even though they have been fooled, cheated and oppressed up to the present." ("Ch'ieh-chieht'ing Miscellany 2: Draft of 'Title Not Yet Decided' No. 9")

Lu Hsün often warmly praised anonymous works of literature, pointing out that the wisdom and genius expressed in the works of the working people themselves was often beyond the reach of persons of renown. Lu Hsün said there was in his hometown a theatrical company known by the name of "Cluster of Jade Company," but the fact belied the name, because the company performed very poorly. An anonymous person wrote the following lampoon about it: "When the Cluster of Jade Company goes on the stage, those below the stage run away. They hurriedly close the doors of the 'temple,' but people scale the walls on both sides till the walls collapse. Then they hurriedly put up the walls again, but only two containers of wonton remain." Lu Hsün held that anonymous works like this could "compare favorably with those of great eminent writers." ("Semi-Gay Life: Done by Accident") Lu Hsün more than once praised the image of "Wu Ch'ang" on the popular stage. The image, created by anonymous authors, crystallized the thoughts and feelings of "lowly people." A line spoken by "Wu Ch'ang" reads: "Though your walls may be made of iron and you related to the emperor and the imperial family...," which was quite moving and expressed the determination not to relent and forgive. Lu Hsün asked: "Can our writers have written that?" ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Layman Talks About Literature") Once Lu Hsün read a report in Shen Pao of April 6, 1928 on a rumor in Nanking that as the Sun Yat-sen Mausoleum was about to be completed, masons tried to extract the spirit of young children to join two sections. As the rumor spread, all children in the city were made by their families to wear on their shoulders a piece of red cloth with a 4-line rhyme to keep away from danger. Full of warmth, Lu Hsün wrote: Although each of the three songs that gained currency consisted of only 20 characters, "they fully described the people's relations with the 'revolutionary' government and their feeling for the revolutionaries. Even accomplished writers skilled in exposing the dark side of society might not be able to express such feeling so well with such simplicity and in such depth." One song says: "He who summons but gets no response will have to hold up the tombstone himself," and this "in fact sums up the biographies of many revolutionaries and the history of China's revolution." ("Three Leisures: Rhymes of Peace") Through his analysis of numerous anonymous works of literature and the role they played in the course of development of literature, Lu Hsün effectively showed that the masses of people--the creators of history--were the most intelligent. "The masses are not so stupid as educated persons think." The view that the common people are an ignorant rabble is the greatest distortion of history.

Without Nameless Ones, There Will Be No Scholars of Renown

Lu Hsün did not oppose all scholars of renown as such, nor did he place persons of renown in direct opposition to the nameless masses without

first analyzing them. Those he hit and pummeled were spokesmen of reactionaries and exploiting classes who deceived people by calling themselves sages, scholars and men of letters. If someone reviled all persons of renown, Lu Hsün pointed out, we should not make a mess of one term, and writers should not be frightened at hearing "high-sounding names" and avoid them like plague. He said, "The first step was already taken by self-respected persons who fled whenever they were called men of letters. But are there really no true great men, true scholars and professors, no true men of letters in the world? Not so." ("Color Literature: Think Once and Act")

Lu Hsün supported truly worthy persons of renown--professors, scholars and men of letters who truly deserved the name. Moreover, he held that these persons should be one of the masses, live among the millions of nameless people who are most intelligent, and represent their demands and hopes in order to be able to achieve something. He said, "History shows that all reforms were at the beginning the task of awakened intellectuals. But these intellectuals must study, be able to think and judge, and have stamina....only he who is one of the masses, I think, can do something for the masses." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Layman Talks About Literature") Proletarian "scholars of renown," too, can be of value to the people and to the progress of history only by making Marxism their guide, consciously taking part in the three major revolutionary movements, being good at absorbing the wisdom of the masses and summing up their experience, and regarding themselves as spokesmen for the millions and millions of nameless people. Lu Hsün pointed out in 1928 that in "an age of transition," "antagonism between classes has probably become extremely acute and the peasant-worker masses are playing an increasingly important role. If one wants to save oneself from decline, one should naturally go to them." ("Three Leisures: Haziness in 'Drunken Eyes'") Here Lu Hsün referred to the road intellectuals should take. In an historical age of great social changes, class struggle is extremely acute, with continuous divisions within the class camps. Intellectuals, who cannot form an independent class, can have a good future only by allying themselves with the worker-peasant masses--the main force of revolution, and, together with the creators of history, walk the only road of history. "Go to them"--this was the most valuable adjuration Lu Hsün gave to all professors, scholars, men of letters and men of science.

Historical experience tells people that once "scholars of renown" separate themselves from the nameless masses, they will accomplish nothing and may even be left behind by the times. Some "scholars of renown" more or less objectively reflect the demands of the nameless people to varying degrees in conformity with the aspirations of the broad nameless masses when they are still unknown, and so gradually win fame. But owing to their class status, they finally lag behind the times after they have won fame, and because they want to preserve their fame, position and property or because of other reasons, they may even take the side opposite that of the broad nameless masses. In his essay "Being Fashionable and Restoring the Old," Lu Hsün summed up in particular depth the historical lessons of such

"scholars of renown" and warned people against repeating their mistakes. Citing as examples Liu Pan-nung, K'ang Yu-wei, Yen Fu and Chang T'ai-yen, and detailing the changes they underwent from fame to disrepute, from "being fashionable" (i.e., being avant-garde) to "restoring the old," Lu Hsün revealed an important question of the relationships between persons of renown and the nameless masses. Before he won fame, Liu Pan-nung fought in the forefront without fear in the "May 4" new cultural movement. He threw himself into the storm of the cultural revolution as early as 1917. The following year, criticizing the restorationist Wang Ching-hsüan, he strongly flailed all erroneous views in society that opposed the colloquial style of writing. He caused quite a stir and consequently became "a man renowned for being 'fashionable'." However, there were people who looked at him with contempt. It was said that he was so upset by this that he went abroad with his wife to study. Later he returned with the title of Doctor of Literature, and naturally gained still more fame. But as "he climbed higher, he became more temperate and genial, and finally became a person of renown, no more and no less." ("Color Literature: Being Fashionable and Restoring the Old") "A man becomes wary as he gains fame, and a hog becomes wary as it gains fat." When a man becomes renowned, he wants to "wrap himself up," lest his "name" might be tarnished. Protecting one's name is the beginning of becoming conservative and the end of one's career--in the end only an empty shell of "person of renown, no more and no less."

K'ang Yu-wei, Yen Fu and Chang T'ai-yen were all advanced Chinese of the late 19th century, outstanding bourgeois characters whose names were household words for a time. Though they were surrounded by different circumstances, they all went over to the opposite side in different degrees, and from being vanguards of social reform, they became stumbling blocks to the progress of history. From being "the leading actor in the coup d'etat of 1898" K'ang Yu-wei became the "head of restorationists." Yen Fu's translation of On the Theory of Evolution rocked China's thinkers of the time, but later he became a member of the Ch'ou An Hui which urged Yuan Shih-k'ai to ascend the throne. Chang T'ai-yen "advocated racial revolution" and was "a hero who pulled the chariot forward," but eventually became a straggler of the times who dragged the chariot backward, and helped Sun Ch'uan-fang revive the Confucian and restorationist rites. Why did these "fashionable" men jointly enact such a tragedy? Lu Hsün writing about Chang T'ai-yen gave this answer: "Once separated from the masses,he gradually sank into decadence." Lu Hsün particularly compared Chang T'ai-yen with Gorky, even more profoundly illustrating the relationship between "scholars of renown" and the masses. Unlike Chang T'ai-yen who "was forgotten by most people" after his death, Gorky "was respected while alive and mourned and honored after his death," being deeply remembered by the broad masses of people. This is because,unlike Chang T'ai-yen who "separated himself from the times with a wall which he and his helpers built," Gorky linked himself closely with the lot of the working class and the masses. As Lu Hsün said about him, "He himself was part of the masses and was linked with them in joy, anger, sadness and happiness." ("Last Collection of Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Two or Three Incidents in the Life of Mr. Chang

T'ai-yen") In his life Gorky took many detours, but guided by Lenin, the great teacher of revolution, he never separated himself from the people and became "a representative of the 'lower order'" and "a proletarian writer." ("Omissions: Short Introduction to Translation of Gorky's January 9")

As early as 1924 Lu Hsün had already profoundly discussed the relationship between the genius and the masses. He pointed out: "A genius is not a monster born and reared spontaneously in the jungle, but is produced and reared by the masses of people capable of producing him and bringing him up. So without such masses of people there will be no genius." ("The Tomb: Before There Was Ever a Genius") Without the masses there will be no genius, and without the nameless masses, no persons of renown. Lu Hsün's analysis of the aforesaid historical figures once more tells us this truth: every outstanding person who played a progressive role in history was outstanding because he reflected the will and wishes of the masses. If he left the masses and attached himself to the so-called "lofty and intelligent" but in fact foolish and ignorant reactionary class, then he was bound to change from being advanced to being backward and reactionary.

Lu Hsün was also a "scholar of renown"--a great revolutionary, thinker, and man of letters of the proletariat. But he was not born a great revolutionary. In his early years, when he had not yet grasped dialectical materialism and historical materialism and was not yet able to solve scientifically from class relations the relationship between an individual and the masses, he had many contradictions and struggles in his thought, and was often anguished at the crossroads. Where Lu Hsün is admirable is that instead of avoiding ideological contradictions or solving them by going backward, he advanced ceaselessly and, in the practice of revolution with the masses as the mainstay and in the intensive study of Marxism-Leninism, he overcame them and gradually brought about an important change in his world outlook. In the course of his advance he already became a famous writer, but "fame" did not form a stumbling block to his continuing advance. He said, "I am not conscious of my 'fame.' Even if I have it, I would never think of taking more care in writing to maintain my fame." ("Outside the Collections: While Chewing") In making revolution, Lu Hsün "wanted nothing, not even fame and position." ("Letters Between Two Places") Things like the Nobel prize, a place in Who's Who, riding in an expensive car and eating first-class meals Lu Hsün rejected. His mind was wholly occupied with the people. "I constantly think of China and about the future, and want to do what little I can for all." ("Letter to Yang Chi-yün, May 22, 1934") He not only expressed--in a moving line of one of his poems, "With head bowed, I will serve the young like an ox"--his lofty proletarian feeling of being closely linked to the masses and dedication to them, but worked hard and practically all his life for "the cause of the masses" until, completely exhausted, he died. In his life Lu Hsün experienced many major splits and changes of class ranks and passed through the two historical stages of the old and the new democratic revolutions. Many fell behind from being vanguards and changed from revolutionaries to reactionaries, but Lu Hsün consistently stood in the van of

of the people's revolution and fought on ceaselessly. That was why he became "the most correct, courageous, resolute, loyal, ardent and unprecedented national hero on the cultural front and representing the great majority of the whole nation charged toward the enemy."

Lu Hsün's fighting path tells us that outstanding "persons of renown" are made by the "nameless" masses, the creators of history, and that "persons of renown" can make valuable contributions to mankind only if they represent the broad "nameless" masses and unite with them. Chairman Mao teaches us: "Only by representing the masses can one educate them, and only by learning from the masses can one be their teacher. If people regard themselves as masters of the masses and as nobles standing high over the heads of the "lowly ones," then no matter how great their abilities are, they will not be needed by the masses and their work will have no future." Studying the series of writings by Lu Hsün concerning the nameless masses will help us further understand this scientific truth of Chairman Mao's, more solidly establish the historical materialistic view that "the masses are the true heroes," further criticize the erroneous view that history is created by heroes as advocated by revisionist chieftains like Liu Shao-ch'i, Lin Piao and Teng Hsioa-p'ing, firmly take the inevitable historical road of unity with the worker-peasant-soldier masses, and advance with still greater youthful vigor under the dictatorship of the proletariat!

* * *

Historical Research, No. 3, June 20, 1976

Table of Contents

The Great Cultural Revolution Will Shine Forever - by the Editorial Departments of Jen-min Jih-pao, Hung-ch'i and Chieh-fang-chün Pao — SPRCM No. 876

The Great Cultural Revolution Is Class Struggle - by K'un Chün — SPRCM No. 899

Why Do Bourgeois Democrats Turn into Capitalist Roaders? - by Yen Hsiao

The Great Change in Lu Hsün's World View - by Chang Cho — SPRCM No. 896

Lu Hsün on "Nameless Ones" - by Hsü Huai-chung, et al — SPRCM No. 901

The Kiangsi Communist Labor University Advances Amid Struggle* - by the Group for Compilation of Brief History of the Kiangsi Communist Labor University

The Social Economy of the Ch'in Shih Huang Era - by Ts'ao Yung-nien and Meng Kuang-yao — SPRCM No. 896

"Proclamations of T'eng, Governor of Nan Prefecture" and Ch'in's Line of Rule of Law - by Shih Yen

Debate Over Shang Yang Reform Between Two Schools in Succeeding Dynasties - by Hung Shan-ssu — SPRCM No. 898

Political Rumors, Usurpation and Restoration (Notes on reading history) - by Workers Theoretical Group, State-Operated Plant 700

About "Yungchen Reform" (Letter from a reader) - by Yang T'ai, Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region

Two-Line Struggle in Li Tzu-ch'eng's Insurgent Army in Late-Ming - by Ts'ao Kuei-lin, et al — SPRCM No. 898

Anti-Russian Struggle by Workers of 36 Sheds — SPRCM No. 889

---

* To appear in a later issue.

Shang Hsien T'ang and the Doctrines of Confucius and Mencius - by Li Tsung-i, et al — SPRCM No. 889

Struggle Between Affirmation and Negation of Jacobin Dictatorship in Modern History of France - by Shih Chin, the Peking Normal University

Revolution Is the Locomotive of History - Study "Class Struggle in France, 1848-1850" - by T'ien Chün

Class Struggle in the Field of Natural Science As Seen from the Early History of the Royal Society of London - by Chao Hung-chou — SPRCM No. 899

Early Tsarist Russian Aggression Against Our Western Regions - by Hsi Ta — SPRCM No. 889

Forum on Chinese Ancient History:

The 8th Lecture — Decline of Feudal Society and Emergence of Capitalism - Ming and Ch'ing

by the Ming-Ch'ing Group, Chinese Historical Museum

* * *

END

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
Springfield, Va. 22161

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PRINTED MATTER

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COM-211

CMP X761231 001
UNIV ILLINOIS LIB AT CHICAGO CIRCLE
LIB SERIALS SEC
BOX 8198
CHICAGO IL 60680